R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 016 463 JC 670 810

THE DIMENSIONS OF THE DEAN'S TASKS, PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONFERENCE FOR NEWLY APPOINTED JUNIOR COLLEGE DEANS (1ST, APPALACHIAN STATE COLLEGE, BOONE, NORTH CAROLINA, AUGUST 6-10, 1962).

FLORIDA UNIV., GAINESVILLE
FLORIDA ST. UNIV., TALLAHASSEE

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.48 35P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *COLLEGE DEANS, *COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION, *LEADERSHIP, *FACULTY EVALUATION, ADMINISTRATOR ROLE, TEACHER ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIP, ADMINISTRATOR RESPONSIBILITY,

THIS 1962 CONFERENCE COVERED FIVE OF A DEAN'S MANY FUNCTIONS--(1) IN COOPERATION WITH THE FACULTY, HE MUST DETERMINE APPROPRIATE COURSES, ESTABLISH THEM, DEVELOP AND EVALUATE THEM, AND CHANGE THEM WHEN NECESSARY. (2) IN HIS DECISION-MAKING, HE MUST BALANCE CONFORMITY AND ANARCHY AND NOTE THE MODERN EMPHASIS ON MAN'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR HIS OWN SOCIAL EVOLUTION. IN THIS ROLE, THE BEST ADMINISTRATOR RELEASES AND USES MOST FULLY THE POTENTIAL OF HIS STAFF. (3) THE DEAN MUST DEMONSTRATE HIS LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR, AS OPPOSED TO HIS INNATE CAPACITY, TO THE PRESIDENT, THE DEPARTMENT HEADS, AND THE STUDENT LEADERS. HE MUST RUN A PRODUCTIVE AND EFFICIENT ORGANIZATION, WITHOUT NEGLECTING CONSIDERATION OF OTHERS. (4) IN ENCOURAGING FACULTY MEMBERS TO THEIR BEST PERFORMANCE, HE CAN (A) BUDGET FOR ALL POSSIBLE SALARY AND FRINGE BENEFITS, (B) REMOVE WORK THAT CAN BE DONE BY NON-CERTIFICATED STAFF, (C) PROVIDE ADEQUATE TIME FOR CLASS PREPARATION OR PRIVATE STUDY, AND (D) SHOW APPRECIATION, IN MANY WAYS, OF THEIR TRUE VALUE AS TEACHERS. (5) THE DEAN MUST USE HIS INFLUENCE IN DEVELOPING THE STUDENTS' SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY BY DEFINING AND ENCOURAGING SELF-RELIANCE AND GIVING RECOGNITION TO THOSE WHO SHOW IT. STUDENT ACTIVITIES, COUNSELING SERVICES, AND THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM ALL CONTRIBUTE TO THIS DEVELOPMENT. (HH)

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY, TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA

THE DIMENSIONS OF

THE DEAN'S TASKS

Proceedings of the First
Conference for Newly
Appointed Deans
August 6-10, 1962
Appalachian State College
Boone, North Carolina

DER A GRANT RECEIVED FROM THE W. K. KELLOGG FOUNDATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE DIMENSIONS OF THE DEAN'S TASKS

Proceedings of the First Conference for Newly Appointed Junior College Deans August 6-10, 1962

JOINTLY SPONSORED BY
THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
AND
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

Held on the Campus of Appalachian State College
Boone, North Carolina

UNDER A GRANT RECEIVED FROM THE W. K. KELLOGG FOUNDATION

AC 000 818

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Daily Program Summary..... i
List of Panel Members and Presiding Officers..... i
List of Participants..... ii

DEVELOPING APPROPRIATE CURRICULUMS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES
by Dr. Thomas Merson, AAJC..... i

FORCES AFFECTING ADMINISTRATIVE "DECISION - MAKING"
by Dr. Willis A. LaVire..... 8

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE DEAN'S LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR
by Dr. Raymond E. Schultz..... 17

DEVELOPING AND RELEASING FACULTY POTENTIAL
by Dr. Maurice L. Litton..... 22

DEVELOPING STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES
by Dr. Thomas Merson..... 27

DAILY PROGRAM SUMMARY

A. M.
9:30 - 10:30..... Address

10:30 - 11:00..... Break

11:00 - 12:00..... Panel

12:00 - 2:00..... Lunch Period

2:00 - 4:00..... Discussion of Topic for the Day

PANEL MEMBERS AND PRESIDING OFFICERS

Panel Members

Dr. E. P. Lauderdale, Junior College of Broward County

Dr. Willis La Vire, University of Florida

Dr. Maurice Litton, Florida State University

Dr. Thomas Merson, American Association of Junior Colleges

Dr. Harvey K. Meyer, University of Florida

Dr. Gordon S. Pyle, Dade County Junior College

Dr. Raymond Schultz, Florida State University

Dr. Robert Wiegman, University of Florida

Presiding

Dr. Robert R. Wiegman, University of Florida

Dr. Maurice Litton, Florida State University

Dr. Harvey K. Meyer, University of Florida

Dr. Willis La Vire, University of Florida

Dr. Raymond E. Schultz, Florida State University

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Participant	College and Address
C. E. Butler	Anderson College, Anderson, South Carolina
J. Marshall Crews	Wilmington College, Wilmington, North Carolina
Raymond P. Carson	Ferrum Junior College, Ferrum, Virginia
John Easley	Brevard Junior College, Cocoa, Florida
William Herbert Good	Gulf Coast Junior College, Panama City, Florida
Henry E. Goodlett	Central Florida Junior College, Ocala, Florida
Lewis Hall	Lees-McRae College, Banner Elk, North Carolina
William A. Hoppe	Lake-Sumter Junior College, Leesburg, Florida
Allison Norman Horton	Orlando Junior College, Orlando, Florida
John M. Jenkins	Gaston Technical Institute, Gastonia, North Carolina
Warren A. Land	Indian River Junior College, Ft. Pierce, Florida
E. P. Lauderdale	Junior College of Broward County, Fort Lauderdale, Florida
A. D. McCary	Northeast Mississippi Junior College, Booneville, Mississippi
J. E. McCracken	Pensacola, Junior College, Pensacola, Florida
Terry O'Banion	Central Florida Junior College, Ocala, Florida
Roy O'Donnell	Mount Olive Junior College, Mount Olive, North Carolina
Frank B. Pesci	Prince George's Community College, Sultland 28, Maryland
Edwin C. Price	St. Johns River Junior College, Palatka, Florida
Gordon B. Pyle	Dade County Junior College, Miami, Florida
John Richardson	Del Mar College, Corpus Christi, Texas
Kenneth T. Stringer	Gatensville Community College, Gatensville 28, Maryland
Robert W. Whetstone	Daytona Beach Junior College, Daytona Beach, Florida

DEVELOPING APPROPRIATE CURRICULUMS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Thomas B. Merson
Assistant Director For Commissions
American Association of Junior Colleges

PART I WHAT ARE APPROPRIATE CURRICULUMS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES?

A dean's duties are many and varied. Routine pressures too frequently prevent him from giving sustained contemplative attention to complex responsibilities which though difficult, demanding and time consuming are essential to long-range growth and efficiency. Orderly, planned, sustained attention to curriculum development must have a high priority on the list of den nds on the dean's time.

A dean's position in the college is pivotal. Ideally his is the responsibility of running a trim ship. He should relieve the president of concern about most internal matters. His duties, responsibilities and authority must be clearly defined and specifically delegated by the president. The dean must earn the president's confidence, but having done that the president must allow the dean every freedom of operation within established policy. Only in such a setting can the dean bring to his position the creativity which is so essential to a progressive institution. Likewise the dean's assigned responsibilities and authority must be clear to the staff. His relations with the staff must be such that he is frequently in a position to further their effectiveness. Things get accomplished with his help; he is an expediter; his office is not a bottleneck.

The dean's responsibilities must be selected on the premise that the major purpose of a college is to provide quality instruction. His major responsibility isn't raising money, building buildings, scheduling student housing or recruiting a football team. When he is faced with decisions he can well apply this criterion: How and to what extent will each of the alternate actions foster excellent instruction? Questions which would demand his time and attention which do not have significant bearing on instruction, either negatively or positively can and should be assigned to others; and hopefully, these tasks even in the hands of others should not detract materially from the basic purposes of the college — instruction and learning.

Courses and curriculums are our principal means of directing the efforts of the college effectively and efficiently towards the end that students may achieve desired goals. Even with a strong staff and excellent students a college can fail to achieve maximum accomplishment if its curriculums and courses are poorly conceived. Both courses and curriculums must be designed primarily in consideration of student needs and student goals. Societal needs, of course, must be weighed at every turn. As dean of the college or dean of instruction one of your major responsibilities and one of your most productive and rewarding efforts will be to guide the orderly development of courses and curriculums so the programs of your college are realistically attuned to the needs of your students and to the needs of society. The only other responsibility which appropriately has equivalent demand for your attention is that of assisting instructors to teach effectively. Teaching and curriculum are so interrelated they are inseperable.

Because community-junior colleges subscribe to goals not sought by other kinds of institutions and because it is through curriculums primarily that these goals are attained, curriculum development in community colleges finds little guidance from sources outside these colleges. Senior colleges and universities are concerned primarily with a select group of students and with programs appropriate for such a group. In contrast, community colleges admit nearly all high school graduates and those of post-high school age who can profit from instruction. If these students are to have a fair chance to succeed community colleges must provide programs appropriate for the wide range of student abilities, interests and achievements and geared to the equally wide range of vocational outlets into which these students will flow following their junior college preparation. Community colleges have in many cases limited reason for being formed unless they do provide for their students many kinds of opportunity not found in senior colleges.

The goals toward which the college subscribes its effort, then, are fundamental points of reference for any decisions about curriculum development. All community colleges should include substantial course and curricular offerings in each of the following categories:

1. University parallel (transfer) programs.
2. Vocational-technical fields.
3. General education.
4. Continuing education and community service.
5. Repair
6. Substantial guidance services undergirding all of them.

Of the almost 700 junior colleges of our nation far too few conceive their mission as broadly as this. It is disheartening to see the number of junior colleges which offer little more than lower-division transfer programs. There is little reason for the existence of a college which is insensitive to needs of major segments of our population. If community colleges are to "fill the educational gap" which is developing between high school programs on one hand and university professional education on the other they must offer a rich assortment of all the kinds of programs listed above. It would seem appropriate for accreditation teams to ask for substantial reasons to justify anything less in two year institutions. The strong community colleges have demonstrated convincingly that each of these programs, different as they are, pay equally high dividends for the effort they require.

Your most important job as dean, then, is to see that your college does provide opportunities for all youth and adults in your community. If the community college does not assume this responsibility some other social agency will emerge to do it; and no other agency presently known is as able to do this well.

The implications of a single institution providing such a wide variety opportunities are almost overwhelming. Those who have not witnessed first-hand the many community colleges which provide a wide range of programs so well may understandingly question that it can be done at all. The bold pioneering of community colleges during the past few decades, however, have produced literally thousands of graduates who testify enthusiastically about "their new life" which these programs have made possible. New deans must recognize that in undertaking such an ambitious effort they will be required to seek solutions to many complex problems which would not be encountered in less bold institutions. A few illustrative problems may give your task added perspective:

Example 1. A Heterogeneous Study Body. Your students by any measure will range from 1-99 percentile. This means you must provide for:

a) many different starting points in all fields to accommodate previous achievement differences
b) many different rates of progress from any starting point because of differences in ability
c) many different directions of movement from any starting point because of differences in interest.

Stated another way this means you must provide not one but many starting points in every field (English, mathematics, science, art, music, foreign language, technology, business, etc); and you must provide for orderly progression in each of these fields. For new deans the question is, do you believe in providing programs from which any student may find opportunity to succeed?

Example 2. Worthy non-academic aptitudes. One college has a publication titled "Brains Aren't Everything" which it uses as a basic guidance tool. This college recognized that students may have aptitudes other than "academic", "verbal", or "computational" which are important, are substantial assets, and merit development. None of us will deny that academic competence is an attribute which we wish was universally distributed liberally to each individual — but it is not. Yet all of us know handicapped people who have developed compensatory traits to an outstanding degree and who by this have gained the admiration of all who know them. A practical problem in this connection is, what should the policy of the college be for students who possess high aptitude in music, art, science mechanics, personal relationships, etc., which is coupled with low verbal aptitude? When a student succeeds very ably in a special field but fails repeatedly in the academic fields, what action should the college take?

Example 3. Maintain Standards at Any Cost! Faculty often want to work only with the most able students. Many will be adamant that all their students must perform at a very high level or they can't waste their time with them. We all agree standards are important but we also pride ourselves in providing excellent instruction. Outstanding instructors will find ways of taking most students the "extra distance" in their courses. Let's hope you can get your faculty to start their instruction at a level all students can grasp and to provide means for each to move forward and upward just as fast and as far as he is able. Your faculty will need your overt assistance with this task. For example, you will enroll students who through self-study, unusual experience or other major advantage demonstrates competence beyond your required program. What challenging opportunity can you provide for them? What credit do you allow? Systematic protesting will usually give you reason to reexamine some of your basic course requirements. For another example let me remind you that you will

have some students who want (and at this point "need") only a short-term course; or you may enroll other students who want work in a limited field. Can you make these opportunities available? Willingly?

These examples were selected to emphasize that if we enroll a heterogeneous group we must provide a variety of programs each with a range of starting and stopping points. We must have a high degree of flexibility and a minimum of rigidity in our regulations. Flexibility and variety are not incompatable with quality and standards, but they are incompatable with artificial, rigid regulations. If your college proposes to realistically "meet the needs of students" you first recognize that students vary in fundamental ways; then you provide situations in which each will be stimulated to unfold in his own form; recognizing, of course, that student growth in acceptable directions is requisite. Standards for measuring student growth may be different without being inferior.

With this general description of community colleges and these comments about problems to be expected to accompany their complex programs, perhaps the following generalized bases for curriculum decisions can be accepted:

1. Student characteristics must be known.
2. Starting points which reasonably assure initial success, finishing points which provide appropriate (even if temporary) ends, and differential progression routes and speeds must all be provided.
3. Means of moving students (both level and direction) with minimum loss to the student must be available and easily accomplished.
4. Fields of study which are related to ultimate use of these studies by various students must be available.
5. The faculty must be committed to the policy that students should be able to find some avenue to success and each should find opportunity to work toward his highest level of attainment.

PART 2 HOW DO YOU ESTABLISH NEW COURSES AND CURRICULUMS?

In a college which is sensitive to student characteristics and which maintains an open line of communication with its community, requests for new courses and evidence supporting need for new curriculums appears in a constant stream from many sources such as:

1. Studies of student characteristics and records.
2. Continuous evaluation of present curriculums.
3. Student's recommendations (follow-up studies, both transfer and non-transfer; attention to student problems; counselor information; drop-out studies; etc).
4. Faculty recommendations (ideas gained at conferences; studies of student progression; class grade analyses; new developments in any field)
5. Surveys of occupational need.
6. Community requests.
7. Announced changes in senior college programs.

In a college disposed to make course and curriculum changes easily and one which seeks opportunity to keep its offerings attuned to the services it should provide it is necessary to have some effective machinery for assuring orderly course and curriculum approval and development. Most colleges have a curriculum committee. In some colleges this committee is a rubber stamp, in others it can discuss but it cannot act. Ideally it is the most important committee in the college and its actions determine the directions of growth of that college. If it is to be effective, it must have full authority to act on basic questions. Its discussions and studies growing out of its discussions frequently produce recommendations for policy change. With such major responsibilities, and recognizing that its actions will affect sometime or other nearly every aspect of college effort, all administrative posts below the president (and perhaps the president too if he has time) should hold voting membership on the committee. In colleges with a divisional organization each divisional chairman can be a member; if the college has a departmental organization a system of grouped representation can be worked out. As projects are selected those affected by any action which might result are invited to temporary membership, or to serve on temporary sub-committees. The dean of instruction appropriately is chairman of the curriculum committee and in that position has responsibility for involving those who may be able to contribute as well as those who will be affected by action taken.

The curriculum committee will assume responsibility for action needed to provide realistic educational opportunities for the students enrolled in the college. It must consider both what is desired and how it may be accomplished. Bottlenecks wherever they appear must be broken. Specifically it must direct attention to the following:

1. To evaluate and change existing curriculums as needed.
2. To formally introduce new curriculums.
3. To formally approve all major course changes and all new courses.
4. To recommend course changes as needed.

Petitions for approval of new courses will be numerous particularly in institutions which have vigorous evening programs. No institution has unlimited resources consequently all petitions for new courses cannot be approved; it is improbable that they all should be approved even where resources are generous. An institution lacking a scheme of planned growth may find its efforts diverted into less essential programs. To provide for orderly course and curriculum growth each college should develop criteria by which the appropriateness of each new course is judged. Criteria which have been successfully used for screening new course proposals are:

1. What evidence is there of potential enrollment?
2. With what existing courses will the new course compete for enrollment?
3. Does the course fill a worthy need not now being met?
4. What duplication or overlapping does the course have with existing courses? Could existing courses be revised to serve this purpose? Is it an extension of any existing course, if so does the existing course need revision also?
5. Are competent staff available?
6. Are adequate facilities available?
7. What will the course cost? Is it worth this cost?
8. Is its purpose within existing policy?
9. Has detailed planning been completed and quality expectations described? (A detailed course outline, catalog description, equipment needs and staff suggestions must accompany a petition for approval of a new course before a committee may reach decisions wisely).
10. What other colleges offer this course and what has been its success?

Decisions regarding additions of new courses are frequently as difficult to make as those about adding new curriculums. Decisions to add new curriculums, however, usually involve a more thorough study and the preparation for adding a new curriculum extends over a longer period of time. Approval of the curriculum entails approval of the component courses as well. Examples of new curriculums which currently are being considered in many colleges are nursing, police arts, electronics, medical technology, etc. Steps frequently taken leading to new curriculum approval might include the following:

1. A survey of need is made with whatever degree of detail seems warranted.
2. Other colleges currently offering this curriculum are visited and pertinent data from their program are gathered.
3. Conferences are attended where discussion of this program is scheduled.
4. Facilities, equipment and staff needs are carefully listed, and estimates of cost are prepared.
5. A detailed paper is prepared which describes needs, expected potential, and issues to be resolved, as well as a detailed outline and discussion of the curriculum.
6. Preliminary contacts are made with agencies or industries which will be involved with or affected by the new program.
7. An advisory committee is established.
8. Potential enrollment is canvassed.
9. Formal action is taken to adopt the curriculum officially.
10. Budget is approved, staff is hired, facilities are prepared, equipment is procured, students are selected and enrolled.

Lead time required for developing a curriculum may be 1-3 years. Sometimes trial acceptance of basic courses is explored in either day or evening programs before the full curriculum is introduced. Following introduction of a curriculum there are several years of shake-down. During these formative years every effort should be made to evaluate its effectiveness and promising other approaches should be tried before its operation becomes traditional and static. Ruts grow deep quickly.

PART 3 DEVELOPMENTS AND ISSUES IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE CURRICULUMS.

One cannot help but be impressed with the rate of increase of numbers of new community colleges and with increases in enrollments in existing colleges. This growth, however, is in its infancy in many states and in these states the community colleges have so many problems of getting the new institutions started they have little choice but to adopt with some minor modifcations curriculums which have proved helpful elsewhere. Significant curriculum developments

come in most cases from secure and stabalized institutions. The primary struggle for emerging institutions is to adopt policies of purpose as outlined in Part 1 of this paper which will enable these colleges as they mature to develop curriculums appropriate to these purposes. You can count on your fingers the states in which significant new curriculum developments are taking place. Too many junior colleges are not making significant curriculum changes as rapidly as these changes are occurring in our industries and our society; to keep pace with social and technological changes today is no easy task. Compared to other institutions of higher education, however, the record of progress of community colleges looks good. The reasons for the slower than desired occurrance of new curricular developments are not difficult to identify: (1) Force of tradition which encourages perpetuation of long standing eminence of liberal arts education for an elite group of scholars, (2) shortage of visionary, crusading leaders and (3) the expressed value system of our society which holds professional education as a more worthy goal than education for other goals.

Some comment on curriculum changes which are taking place, and a brief discussion of some of the issues relating to these changes may be in order.

Transfer Curriculums

Changes in transfer curriculums which are common include:

1. A tightening of standards, including admissions requirements.
2. Increased prerequisites.
3. Elevation of high school preparation particularly in English, science, mathematics and foreign language.
4. Reshuffling of content within courses particularly in science and mathematics but by no means limited to these fields.
5. Shortened lag of including newly discovered information in current courses.

Means by which junior colleges can keep abreast of these changes include:

1. Developing liaison committees with senior colleges by subject field or department. The exchange of ideas and techniques, and the discussion of problems quickly develops improved understanding and increased mutual respect.
2. Conducting annual or biennial student follow-up studies.
3. Assigning someone in each college to keep informed about impending changes in each senior college.

Changes which may be expected in the future are difficult to predict. Because of the long history of stability of transfer programs only minor changes can be expected in these programs. But as junior colleges enroll more than half of the lower division students in a state, junior college staff can and should raise their voices and claim partnership rights in prescribing these programs.

One of the controversial developments which may increase rapidly is that of senior institutions becoming more selective with respect to admission of transfer students. We know students in any graduating classes vary from institution to institution. There seems to be some concern that senior institutions may increasingly use screening tests as a basis of admission for transfer students. It may be hoped that this problem may be resolved to the mutual satisfaction of both kinds of institution and that when screening is required the most valid criteria will be applied.

Vocational-Technical Curriculums

In this field the community college has free rein and tremendous potential. Some community colleges have splendid vocational-technical programs of long standing. Many colleges, however, not only are indifferent to these programs but some even question whether they appropriately belong in any post-high school institution. The writer has difficulty understanding how any two-year institution can be insensitive to the needs of our technological society and to the needs of thousands of youth and adults whose lives can be improved through these programs. Certainly one of the major challenges to the entire community college movement is the need to extend enlightenment about the world of work.

Promising curriculum developments are occurring in many vocational-technical fields. Changes which warrant special comment are found in engineering (industrial) related technologies and health-related technologies.

Engineering-related technologies. A major move forward can be expected within the very near future as a result of several developments:

1. The American Association of Junior Colleges Curriculum Commission has a major project underway specifically designed to assist community colleges to introduce and strengthen these programs. At a recent meeting with leaders of industry, the Association received strong encouragement and promise of unlimited cooperation from these industrial leaders. We hope very soon community colleges in every state will have programs which supply industry with needed manpower and inustry will seek these graduates as eagerly as they now seek engineers.
2. Congress has become intensely interested in technical programs and the effort of Congressman John Brademas and his committee this year gives hope that very soon substantial financial assistance will be available to encourage the development of these programs. A committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Willis, Superintendent, Chicago Schools, is preparing a report to be used as a basis for recommendations by the United States Office of Education with reference to desirable reorganization of their programs in these fields. Recent legislation supporting retraining programs offers another substantial opportunity.
3. The Engineers Council for Professional Development during the past year has been developing criteria for accrediting technical programs. It is hoped these criteria will help guide the development of some programs even if the application of the criteria to community college programs is limited.

In this rapid development which is already well started in some colleges, and which can be expected to accelerate in the next few years many issues must be resolved. There are at present two influential groups each recommending or supporting different programs. On one hand are the ECPD endorsed programs which unfortunately have, since their beginning, carried the description "less than college grade." Neither extreme describes the full need for trained manpower of our nation and it is quite probable that the community college movement will embrace both and be recognized as the institution most appropriately organized for this worthwhile service to society. It is realistic to believe that over three-fourths of those gainfully employed will have opportunity to prepare themselves for employment in tomorrow's community colleges.

Business-Related fields. The business fields are undergoing change almost as rapidly as the industrial fields. Graduates of well established fields such as secretarial practice and accounting will continue to be in demand although their preparation must undergo substantial revision. Fields with potential for tremendous expansion include: data processing, business management, distributive education and salesmanship. It is probable that employment in all these fields in the near future will require preparation which we hope will be available in community colleges.

Health-Related Fields. The outstanding record of graduates from vocational nursing and registered nursing programs gives us substantial evidence to urge community colleges to introduce and promote programs for dental assistants, dental hygienists, dental technicians, medical secretaries, medical assistants, medical technicians, and other similar fields.

If community colleges do not provide the manpower needed in these fields it will have missed a golden opportunity to serve in an important way.

General Education

There have been few substantial successful innovations in general education during the past decade. Nevertheless, there is growing acceptance that single-subject centered courses do not achieve desired general education aims. Planned, integrated, inter-departmental courses stressing broad principles are receiving increasing (though hesitant) support. Junior colleges have tended to follow the leadership of universities in developing general education programs — and universities haven't provided vigorous leadership. Reluctance of universities to accept variant courses has been a deterrent to junior colleges developing unique general education courses. However, universities exert no such controlling influence on non-transfer programs and junior colleges have not demonstrated a visionary break-through with general education programs in these curriculums. The obstacles are many; perhaps the greatest obstacle is the lack of staff who are imbued with missionary zeal in this field. Perhaps we need a national crisis to direct our attention to a challenge which should be obvious.

Evening Programs

Continuing education and community service programs probably constitute the greatest development potential of the future. Many community colleges are now enrolling two or three times as many students in evening programs as in day programs. These programs cover every field of the day program and in addition many fields which offer special opportunity for vocational up-grading and retraining, as well as social, political and economic enlightenment.

In many communities these programs are offered by an agency other than the community college. Experience has shown that no other institution can do this so well as the community college. Invariably when one of these programs is transferred to a dynamic community college it improves. Strangely there is some reluctance on the part of community colleges to accord full status to evening programs. Many still offer a large proportion of "no-credit" courses — an admission that they are regarded as sub-standard. Again, because these courses differ from courses offered in day programs does not in itself make them inferior. Evening courses can be and often are stronger than comparable regular-day courses.

There are so many economic and sociological improvements in our respective communities which could be achieved by well conceived community service programs. The response of the community and of the community leaders to visionary evening programs is always substantial. Won't you deans search for ways your college can contribute to the general vitality of your community through such programs ?

Repair Instruction

The door of college opportunity is closing with frightening speed in four year colleges and universities. And this is happening at a time when our society is demanding extended education for increasing numbers. Community colleges located at the doorstep of so many will motivate even larger numbers to seek education beyond high school. And many of the 1/3 of high school students who drop out before graduation may after post-adolescent maturation find greater reason to apply themselves to further education. Combine all of these considerations with the fact that selective admissions criteria have at least some degree of artificiality and couple this further with the wide range of opportunities both vertical and horizontal that community college offer, as well as the fine guidance staff who are able to help students select programs which will develop latent talent and we have a strong argument for community colleges accepting repair programs as a legitimate major function. The records of community colleges in assisting marginal students to succeed has been almost phenomenal. This promises to gain greater respectability as the community college increasingly becomes more proficient as a great distributing agency.

Summary

This paper has been a plea to community colleges to provide varied realistic programs for all who could profit from post-high school education. It proposed that instruction was the major concern of a college and that well planned curriculums were the primary means by which good instructors could achieve greatest effectiveness. As a conclusion it suggests that community colleges will fill a widening educational gap if they give vigorous attention to vocational technical programs, continuing education programs and programs designed to give another chance to those who earnestly desire further education. Deans are urged to assume leadership for increasing understanding of the values to our society of such an effort.

FORCES AFFECTING ADMINISTRATIVE "DECISION-MAKING"

by
Willis A. LaVire
University of Florida

In discussing any topic, each of us ultimately must speak from a personal belief base derived from our acceptance of certain alternatives and our rejection of others. In other words, we have exercised choice in selecting from among alternatives. We have made personal decisions, for the act of decision is precisely that of selecting from among possible alternatives.

All of the activities engaged in by humans are essentially the manifestation of a continuous decision-making process. Even the profound decision of whether to go on living or to annihilate oneself represents a choice between alternatives. Every person on earth is a decision-maker unless, of course, the non-possession of an intellect totally deprives him of the ability to foresee consequences resulting in a failure to perceive alternatives.

Every person is not only a personal decision-maker, he is also a social decision-maker. The alternatives with which he is faced exist not only in relation to himself, but also in his relationship with others. Because the personal and social decisions one must make are completely and inextricably interwoven, these foci for decision-making will be treated as one throughout this discussion. However, it is anticipated that the frame of reference will be derived largely from the institutional and social context since the topic under consideration is addressed to decision-making in educational administration.

The decisions we make in education are the product of our personal beliefs tempered by the beliefs of others. In the past, our personal beliefs have been primary in formulating decisions, but social enlightenment and research are forcing the administrator to give ever-increasing attention to the participation of others in decision-making. Compatibility with this trend requires that the basic beliefs of the administrator be congruent with the underlying beliefs which nourish the trend. Oddly enough, the anguish engendered by the changing concept of leadership is a direct result of the demand of an increasingly enlightened citizenry to bring practices more in line with our democratic ideology.

The issue which confronts mankind today is without peer in the consequences its alternatives pose for mankind. At stake is man's role in his destiny. It is a question of the amount of faith man is willing to invest in himself. One alternative in the issue would infer small faith in that it would encourage man to wager his destiny on the operation of some absolute beyond his control. The remaining alternative would infer a profound faith for herein man is encouraged to wager his destiny on himself. Man has never been confronted with a more fundamental decision. This decision is in the process of evolving before our eyes and it will be the true measure of the confidence and potential residing in the human species.

Until the turn of our century, the forces influencing this decision strongly suggested that man had best leave his destiny in hands other than his. However, in the last 50 to 60 years, certain irresistible counter forces are persuading man that he accept trusteeship for his social evolution. The issue is drawn and the decision is being made. Conflicting theories and conflicting behaviors spring from this issue, and nowhere are the conflicts more clearly visible than in the decision-making process. The conflicts in decision-making theory as expressed through leadership theory can be resolved only when man makes his basic decision -- the question of the placement of his destiny. As mentioned, this decision is evolving, ponderously but irresistibly; slowly but accelerating. In other words, the trend of the evolving decision is such that certain predictions can be made with a degree of confidence once the conflicting forces are brought into perspective.

It is the intention in this discussion to focus upon the major forces bearing upon this decision and to relate these forces to the conflicts which we observe in our field of educational administration. The consideration will be incomplete, but it will serve to illustrate the fundamental character of the forces which are effectuating the changing mood in America, and to a lesser degree, elsewhere. The contributing forces which will be examined are man's philosophy and psychology, and the results from his research.

Man's Philosophy and Psychology as a Force

Consider for a moment the tremendous ego-shrinking which man has undergone in his brief history on earth. He began his tenure in the belief that the earth was the center of the universe. Observation told him that he was the dominant creature of earth and his logic took him an addi-

tional step to the idea that he, therefore, was king of the universe. This position gave him an unparalleled stature.

But things began to happen which served to diminish this stature. Copernicus put him (man) somewhere else besides the center of the universe. To add to this jolt, Darwin evolved him from apes and again man had to face up to the realization that he was not so unique as he had thought. However, to this point, man was still left with a rationality to support his ego. Then along came Freud and removed this distinction by maintaining that man was irrational and controlled by his desires.

Man, however, was still comforted by the idea that his intelligence made him unique in the universe. Modern astronomy has taken care of this final step in the ego-shrinking process with the observation that it is highly improbable that man is unique in his intelligence or even that he is leading in the intelligence department.

As if all of this were not enough to shake any respectable species to its core, he has been constantly reminded by himself that he is a wicked, evil creature, and that the proper attitude for being is one of apology.

Concomitant with his ego-shrinking, homo sapiens has developed guiding theories further abolishing his claim to uniqueness. His reliance upon external absolutes for his direction denied the consideration of his positive potential. The cosmic or cyclic theories of Hegel, Sorokin, Sumner, Spengler, Ogburn, and Marx were in common in that they inferred certain absolutes over which man had no control. What is the purpose of man's using his potential if his potential is negated by some unchangeable absolute which is guiding his direction?

Within the last 60 years, man has been taking tremendous strides in repairing his shrunken ego. The Dark Ages of self-deprecation is giving way to a Renaissance based upon man's faith in himself.

The pillars for this Renaissance are formed from rebellious man — a rebellion born of enlightenment. This enlightenment is particularly evident in the areas of philosophy, psychology, and the scientific method of research.

When philosophers, like John Dewey, began to question the idea that man was subservient to and at the mercy of an impervious absolute, the direction was pointed for an uphill climb. Dewey, greatly influenced by Darwin's concept of biological evolution, applied the concept of evolution to man's social life. Dewey maintained that it is necessary to transmit two lives if man is to preserve his civilization. One life is biological and is dependent upon nutrition and reproduction for transmission; the other life is social and is dependent upon his social and physical environments for transmission. Without the transmission of both, civilization would perish.

Dewey infers that these two lives of man account for two kinds of evolution. Thus far, we have been able to influence biological evolution very little and there are those that believe that this evolution has about run its course. However, in social evolution man is still able to fulfil his greatest promise. Man, because of the tools now at his disposal in the form of the scientific method and democratic processes, is able, for the first time in his history, to exercise control over his social evolution. This sincere gesture in placing man's destiny back in his hands has done much to bolster a faltering ego. The existentialists in an extreme effort would place man back in the center of the meaningful universe by making him the measure of all worth.

Man is re-examining another view which has been his inheritance since his beginning. This view has to do with the relationship of individuality and cooperative procedures. He is re-examining because his traditional view conflicts with his promise of dignity and self-direction.

As man views this relationship in perspective, it is beginning to appear that, historically, he has placed individuality and cooperation on opposite extremes of the same continuum. As a result he has tended to create a relationship which would insure a balance between the two extremes. In this view, the desirable would be placed somewhere in the middle on the cooperation-individuality continuum. He would neither go far in stressing cooperative procedures, nor would he go far in releasing individual potential, for in the one instance he would produce conformity (mass man), and in the other he would beget anarchy.

As a result of this reasoning, man has had his champions for more of one and less of the other throughout recorded history. Historians view the anarchy bred by Sophism, with the resultant immobility in the area of cooperative procedures, as the basic cause of the decline of Athenian democracy. Rousseau spoke in terms of the natural development of the individual unfettered by social learnings. On the other hand, Riesman in Lonely Crowd expresses concern for

the shift of emphasis from "inner-directedness" to "other-directedness." William Whyte, Jr., expresses his concern in Organization Man much in the same vein when he talks about the shift from the "Protestant ethic" to the "social ethic."

As man looks about him, he observes a universal need for greater realization in communications, social processes, and cooperative procedures. He sees also a universal need for a greater release of the potential inherent in each individual. He is realizing that the traditional view has resulted in a half-development in these two areas, and that this has created a situation he can ill afford. Man is in the process of rejecting the notion that these two areas of concern are contrary and detrimental to each other. In fact, he is beginning to say that individuality and cooperative processes are mutually dependent and that the greater the realization of either, the greater the realization of the other. He is rejecting the traditional claim that individuality cannot be harmonized with social ends and values in a progressive advance of both. He is now saying that the growth of human personalities (the release of individual potential) in a humane social order can be achieved. Another wall is crumbling before man's insatiable quest for his fullest realization. And so another force contributes to the controversy which currently is centered on the decision-making structure.

In psychology, J. B. Watson,[1] the founder of the behavioristic school of thought, and his followers had compounded a mechanistic explanation of man. The individual, pictured as a machine-like collection of reflexes and habits, was alleged to be activated by external stimuli which set off behavioral responses usually predictable from past experience or previous conditioning. The individual is thus machine-like and as such, is at the complete mercy of external forces.

Another body of theory came from Sigmund Freud in his reaction against the behavioristic, mechanistic theory just discussed. Oddly enough, the theory of Freud treated man with equal disdain as did the theory he rebuffed. Freud's model of man was as behavioristic as the models of the behaviorists, though in another way. Instead of employing the analogy of a machine to explain the nature of the individual, Freud and those who followed his psychoanalytic theories used the analogy of a hydraulic system. Man, according to this view, is motivated to behavior by internal pressures seeking external expression. Although the hydraulic-system model permitted a much more dynamic theory of human behavior than the machine model, it still involved the same notion of the individual as a passive victim of forces, in this case internal forces.

Joining with the recent philosophers in salvaging man from the muck, certain psychologists today are rejecting these disparaging conceptions of man. They are calling for a new point of view in which the individual is seen as exhibiting a great deal more self-determination and purposeful behavior. Prescott Lecky, for example, feels that psychology must throw off the burden of the over-simplified mechanistic explanation of human behavior. To Lecky, man is an active determiner of his own destiny. He picks and chooses which aspects of his environment he wishes to react against for man is continuously seeking ways to realize his own nature.

One of the recent battlegrounds for the controversy about man's nature is in the area of psychotherapy. In one approach to treating the emotional problems of the individual, it can be inferred that the psychologist has little faith in the capacities and potentialities of his clients. In this view, the psychologist by virtue of his superior knowledge and training, takes upon himself almost complete responsibility for the process of improvement. In this clinical or directive approach, responsibility for understanding and solving the problem lies not with the patient, but essentially with the "expert" to whom the patient has come for help.

In the past fifteen years, however, a new approach to psychotherapy has emerged in which the psychologist actually practices a much more complete and consistent belief in the capacity of the individual. The approach continues the recent trend to restore faith in the individual. Carl Rogers, in his belief in client-centered therapy, expresses a firm conviction that the emotionally disturbed individual is capable of assuming responsibility for his own psychological re-education, that he can, without the interference of the psychologist, become self-directing.

Thus the forces of recent philosophical and psychological thinking have tended to serve as contributing factors in man's search for identity. He is now told that he is valued as a worthwhile individual and, further, that he is capable of determining his destiny because of his intelligence. Woe be to those who would attempt to interfere with this Juggernaut once momentum is achieved.

Another factor which is lending support to the evolving structure for decision-making is that of democratic ideology. Increased education results in increased enlightenment and increased

---

[1] Thomas Gordon, in his book titled, Group Centered Leadership, clearly draws the issue in psychology for which the writer expresses his acknowledgement and appreciation.

enlightenment questions the discrepancy between practice and theory. For example, verbal support is given to the democratic process as a desirable means for governing human relationships, yet we defer to authoritarian administrative and classroom arrangements. We justify this behavior on the basis that the democratic method is inefficient, that the authority figure is the expert, that people are incapable of thinking intelligently, or that professional preparation is pre-requisite for decision-making. An enlightened man is beginning to perceive that the democratic process is the only positive means at his disposal for resolving conflict, and that he learns this process best by living it. He is beginning to realize that the voters of our country are entrusted with making far more important decisions than could possibly be encountered in the educational system, and that far greater respect and satisfaction accrue through the releasing of potential in others than in inhibiting that potential. The concept of the divine right of kings, with us still in the cloak of "papa knows best," is cacophonous to the enlightened democratic ear.

Verbal support is given to the desirability of preparing individuals capable of independent functioning, yet teachers and others are exposed to a constant barrage of dependency-creating environments. An authoritarian climate demands a status figure, a person to whom the followers can look to for direction. People learn best what they live, and regular exposure to a dependency-creating environment will produce dependent individuals. Enlightened man resents these situations. He is saying that the democratic sponsoring nation. It is safe to assume that increasedenlightenment through education within the context of a democratic environment will continue to press the demand for increasing the use of democratic procedures and processes in the area of policy decision-making.

The Impact of Research as a Force

The impact of research has come primarily from the behavioral and social sciences. The great bulk of this research simultaneously offers support and receives support from the forces which have been mentioned thus far as those which are on the initiative in forcing a re-definition of the decision-making process; namely, man's philosophy and psychology.

Man has long been influenced in the direction that competition[2] serves as his fundamental means of progress. This inclination was oriented and propelled in large measure by a survival of the fittest notion. Among the foremost contributors to this concept were: Adam Smith with his The Wealth of Nations, published in 1776; Malthus in his Essay on Population, written in 1798; Darwin with his Origin of the Species, published in 1859; the scientist, Huxley, published in 1888 his Struggle for Existence; the necessary philosophical justification for the theories of Darwin and Huxley was supplied in masterly fashion by Nietzche in his The Will to Power, written in 1889. Nietzsche viewed life as a battle in which strength rather than goodness, pride rather than humility, unyielding intelligence rather than altruism, and power rather than justice were the necessary concerns of man. He concluded that theories of equality and democracy had been disproven by the laws of selection and survival, therefore, democratic procedures were decadent.

Opposed to this view, conclusions coming from research in the social and behavioral sciences indicate to man that his fundamental method of progress is that of cooperation. Peter Kropotkin in his Mutual Aid, A Factor in Evolution, published in 1902, thus concluded that unsociable species that reduced to its lowest limits the individual struggle for existence and developed mutual aid to the greatest extent were the most numerous, the most prosperous, and the most likely to develop further. Montague in On Being Human, published in 1950, assembled an array of evidence from the investigations conducted in the various scientific disciplines and concluded that the true nature of man's life is cooperation.

Le Barre, in his The Human Animal published in 1954, basing his studies on human biology, cultural anthropology, psychiatry, and related fields concluded that the evolution and growth of mankind is primarily dependent on cooperative procedures.

Research is serving to penetrate yet another time-honored province; namely, if man accepts the idea that he is capable of self-determination, where is the source of wisdom for guiding this social evolution? There are those that believe that this wisdom for the guidance of man's destiny is to be found only in a single individual or in a restricted group of indeviduals. William Stanley, in his Education and Social Integration, furnished historical evidence to the contrary. His evidence indicated that common man (or the masses) can be depended upon for decisions of greater wisdom in terms of the general welfare than can a so-called elite of any make-up.

Harold Laski in an article titled, "The Limitations of the Expert," published by Harpers Magazine, had the following to say in connection with the role of the expert:

---

[2]Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, in their book titled Educational Administration, clearly summarize the distinction between the competitive and mutual aid theories for which the writer is deeply indebted.

No one, I think, could seriously deny today that in fact none of our social problems is capable of wise resolution without formulation of its content by an expert mind. . .

But it is one thing to urge the need for expert consultation at every stage in making policy; it is another thing, and a very different thing, to insist that the expert's judgment must be final . . . Above all, perhaps, and this most urgently where human problems are concerned, the expert fails to see that every judgment he makes not purely factual in nature brings with it a scheme of values which has no special validity about it. He tends to confuse the importance of his facts with the importance of what he proposes to do about them. . .

The expert, I suggest, sacrifices the insight of common sense to the intensity of his experience. No one can read the writings of Mr. F. W. Taylor, the efficiency-engineer, without seeing that his concentration upon the problem of reaching the maximum output of pig-iron per man per day made him come to see the laborer simply as a machine for the production of pig-iron. He forgot the complexities of human nature, the fact that the subject of his experiments had a will of his own whose consent was essential to effective success. . .

The expert, again, dislikes the appearance of novel views. Here, perhaps the experience of science is most suggestive since the possibility of proof in this realm avoids the chief difficulties of human material. Everyone knows of the difficulties encountered by Jenner in his effort to convince his medical contemporaries of the importance of vaccination. The Royal Society refused to print one of Joule's most seminal papers. The opposition of men like Sir Richard Owen and Adam Sedgwick to Darwin resembled nothing so much as that of Rome to Galileo. Not even so great a surgeon as Simpson could see merit in Lister's discovery of antiseptic treatment. The opposition to Pasteur among medical men was so vehement that he declared regretfully that he did not know he had so many enemies. Lacroiz and Poisson reported to the French Academy of Sciences that Galois' work on the theory of groups, which Cayley later put among the great mathematical achievements of the nineteenth century, was quite unintelligible. Everyone knows how biologists and physicists failed to perceive for long years the significance of Gregor Mendel and Willard Gibbs. . .

The Duke of Wellington was never brought to see the advantage of the breech-loading rifle. . .

The expert, in fact, simply by reason of his immersion in a routine, tends to lack flexibility of mind once he approaches the margins of his special theme. He is incapable of rapid adaptation to novel situations. He unduly discounts experience which does not tally with his own. . . Specialism seems to breed a horror of unwonted experiment, a weakness in achieving adaptability, both of which make the expert of dubious value when he is in supreme command of a situation. . .

We must ceaselessly remember that no body of experts is wise enough, or good enough, to be charged with the destiny of mankind. Just because they are experts, the whole of life is, for them, in constant danger of being sacrificed to a part; and they are saved from disaster only by the need of deference to the plain man's common sense."

Laski has been quoted to some extent because he tends to point clearly to one of the basic divisions which currently is felt in existing decision-making structure; namely, the role of the expert in the decision-making process.

Furthering the attack on the traditional view concerning the source of wisdom for the direction of man's social evolution, Stanley has this to say:

> Certainly a study of recent polls of public opinion, where the facts are sufficiently clear to permit a definite judgment as to the relative merits of the case, does not reveal that the wealthier or more highly placed portions of the nation are superior, in public spirit or in wisdom, to the rank and file.

James Truslow Adams, the brilliant and conservative historian, in his book, New England in the Republic, 1776-1850, comments:

> The history of New England shows us again and again, as a matter of practical statecraft, how the 'wise,' the rich, and the 'good' have shown less collective wisdom than the members of the despised lower orders, as well as a more bitter class spirit, a narrower intellectual outlook, and a less broadly human attitude toward life.

This verdict is fully confirmed by the dean of American anthropologists, Frank Boas, in a passage from Anthropology and Modern Life:

> The masses of the people . . . respond more quickly and more energetically to the urgent

demands of the hour than the educated classes, and that the ethical ideals of the best among them are human ideals, not those of a segregated class.

And man continues his march from the muck, supported by yet more research. This time he gains confidence from the results flowing from the study of group dynamics and leadership. One of the earliest excursions in group dynamics was into the consumer's mind. This resulted when marketing men called for scientific information on mass buying motivations. Its next move was into the employee's mind and there it turned out for management some "brand-new" theories in employee relations.

From this simple beginning in business and industry, interest in the study of group dynamics is evidenced in the fields of government, education, religion, health and welfare. In recent years social psychologists have devoted more and more effort to the study of group phenomena and this study is progressing in a direction of direct concern to educational administrators. The aim is to increase man's understanding about how and why small groups act as they do. The administrator's interest is clear for if an administrator is skilled in his understanding of the mechanics of a small group's behavior, he will be able to unlock more of the potential of his staff and his community. The administrator, realistic soul that he is, knows that group dynamics is not something that may or may not occur in a group, depending on the wish of the leader. He realizes that every meeting and every group has its own dynamics, its own pattern of forces. With two or more people meeting, there are interaction, interpersonal relationships, group goals, problems of communication, and many, many other forces. These forces exist in varying degrees, but they are potentially present in any group situation.

General statements and principles pertaining to the study of group processes are evolving in harmony with man's newly-discovered concept of self. The following list is taken from "Some Skills for Improving Group Dynamics" by David H. Jenkins and Alvin Zander. To become productive, a group needs to develop increased ability:

1. To exchange ideas among the members freely and clearly, using language understood by everyone and with no fears of starting arguments or hurting feelings.
2. To examine objectively how well the group and its members are working.
3. To share the leadership jobs among the group members and to become sensitive to the feelings of all.
4. To accept new ideas and new members into the group without undue conflict and to discipline itself to work toward long-range objectives and to profit from failures.
5. To think clearly about its problems, finding causes and working through to solutions. In other words, the employment of sound problem-solving procedures.
6. To adjust its procedures and plans to meet the feelings and the desires of the members.
7. To create new jobs or committees as needed and to terminate them, or the group itself, when the need is passed.

Kurt Lewin, based upon his studies of social conflict, ventured the following statements:

1. It is a fallacy to assume that people, if left alone, follow a democratic pattern in their group life.
2. In regard to changing from one cultural pattern to another, experiments indicated that autocracy can be imposed upon a person. Democracy cannot be imposed upon a person; it has to be learned by a process of voluntary and responsible participation. It takes more time to change from autocracy to democracy than vice-versa.
3. The democratic leader does not impose his goals on the group as does the autocratic leader; the policy determination in democracy is done by the group as a whole.
4. The experiments in training of democratic leaders indicate strongly that it does not suffice to have sub-leaders who deal with the small face-to-face groups trained in democratic procedures. Power above them must apply democratic procedures or lower bracket democratic leadership will fade away.

Kurt Lewin, in his studies of social climates has shown man that the laissezfaire approach produces the least productive and the most highly frustrated individuals; that the persons functioning in an authoritarian climate occupied a position between laissez-faire and democracy in terms of production and level of frustration.

Man is making inquiry about the nature of this authoritarian fellow who would stand in his way. In a comprehensive study carried on for five years by T. W. Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson, and Sanford and reported under the title, The Authoritarian Personality, the researchers concluded that about ten per cent of the population of the United States is predominantly authoritarian and that another twenty per cent have strong tendencies in that direction. The bulk

of the population cluster around the middle on an authoritarian-democratic scale, but nearly all of the people have some tendencies toward authoritarianism. On the basis of this study, the researchers formed the following profile of the authoritarian personality:

1. There is a submissiveness to conventional mores. The authoritarian personality conforms to conventional mores, not because they are logical or sensible, but because he must conform. He feels compulsive; his behavior is irrational. Just as he is compulsive so he is compulsive about demanding that others conform. In a strong authoritarian leader he finds one who will give him the security he seeks.

2. There is an aggressiveness, rather than consideration, to other points of view.
3. There is a preoccupation with dichotomy of leader-follower, strong-weak, right-wrong.
4. There is general hostility toward others.
5. There is an inclination toward narrow ethnocentric attitudes.
6. There is an inclination toward super-patriotic attitudes.
7. The authoritarian personality is rigid, inflexible. His horizons are limited to that which he has learned as acceptable; all else is threatening. He tends to see situations as black or white, as right or wrong. He finds it difficult to admit that he knows little about many subjects and that much which he considers true today may be disproved tomorrow.

Since 1900 over 500 pieces of research into the nature of leadership have been conducted in education, the armed services, labor, industry, and government. Up until 1935 the research was largely an attempt to discover the traits possessed by a person who was a leader. Efforts in this direction proved to be unproductive in that no traits emerged which served to differentiate the leader from the follower. As a result, after 1935 the researchers moved into a situational approach, an attempt to describe the type of leadership which emerges in various situations.

The conclusions based on the research since 1900 are as follows:

1. Leadership is a group role. A person does not exert leadership except as he participates in a group.
2. Other things being equal, the amount of leadership is dependent upon the frequency of interaction.
3. Leadership may be exerted without possessing any type of official status. In fact, official status may interfere with the individual exerting leadership within a group.
4. Leadership is more complex and diffuse than has been assumed. A group does not have one leader. Many individuals within the group exert leadership for other group members.
5. The leadership that a group uses is determined by the norms of the group. If an individual violates the critical norms of a group, his participation will not be used as leadership by the group. Group members select for leaders individuals they believe will perceive and maintain the group norms.
6. Leadership and followership are interchangeable. The characteristics that make a person a good leader also make him a good follower, and vice versa.
7. Leadership shifts from situation. A group uses the members within it who can help solve the problem confronting the group. Official leadership releases the full power of a group as it makes possible group members using the special abilities that are needed by the group at a given moment.
8. The extent to which a group is able to use the participation of a member as a part of the leadership function is determined by its perception of him as individual. Group members tend to give positive ratings to persons they like and negative ratings to persons they dislike.

The essential difference between traditional and democratic theories lies precisely in the decision-making process. The decision-making process is essential to both theories simply because decisions must be made. The difference lies in how they are made and who makes them. For the purposes of this discussion, a twofold classification of decisions will be used. The decisions of any educational institution can be classified as policy decisions ar as executive or implementing decisions.

In traditional theory, policy formulation, policy execution, and policy evaluation are dependent upon the status leader at the top of the power echelon. He may delegate decisions to those lower in the administrative hierarchy, but veto power serves to vest control in the status leader in the top position. Since the person at the top makes the policy decisions, the organizational structure beneath him serves the sole function of implementing the policy decisions. The traditional line and staff organization serves this theory well. Since decisions of evaluation are the function of the person who made the policy decisions there is nothing much found wanting in the

line and staff orgainzational structure.

The traditional theory rests upon certain assumptions: (1) that leadership is the prerogative of status; (2) that good human relations are necessary in order that the followers accept decisions of status leaders; (3) that all responsibility is held by administrators holding positions in the power echelon; (4) that final responsibility for all matters is placed in the administrator at the top of the power echelon; (5) that authority and power can be delegated but that responsibility cannot be delegated; (6) that if a person is responsible for a program or activity he should have the power and authority to make all decisions; (7) that the individual finds security in a protected climate in which status leaders protect the interests of all persons in the organization; (8) that evaluation is the prerogative of status leaders; (9) that unity of purpose is secured through loyalty to status leaders; and (10) that maximum production is attained in a climate of competition and pressure.

If one accepts these assumptions, it is quite logical to conclude that the administrator at the top of the echelon should either make all decisions or have veto power over decisions made by all other persons in the organization.

As has been pointed out throughout this paper the mood of man is changing. His ego is being restored by philosophy and psychology as a result of his enlightenment. His quest for self-realization and self-determination will not now be satisfied by outmoded models. With these great forces to support him, he is demanding a greater voice in his destiny and he will have it. A newer theory of decision-making has had to emerge in answer to this demand. And it might be added that this theory still is emerging.

The democratic, or emerging, theory of leadership is based on assumptions more nearly in accord with man's developing confidence. These assumptions are: (1) that leadership is not confined to those holding status positions in the power echelon; (2) that responsibility as well as power and authority can be shared; (3) that everyone affected by a program or policy should share in decision-making with respect to that policy; (4) that the line and staff organization is exclusively for the purpose of dividing labor and implementing policies and programs developed by the total group affected; (5) that the individual finds security in a dynamic climate in which he shares responsibility for decision-making; (6) that evaluation is a group responsibility; (7) that good human relations are essential to group production and the meeting of the needs of the individual members of the group; (8) that unity of purpose is secured through consensus and group loyalty; and (9) that maximum production is attained in a threat-free climate.

It can be seen that although traditional theory is perfectly satisfied by a line and staff organization which determines and also executes policy, the requirements of emerging theory are not met. Something else is needed because the line and staff organization does not provide for equality in decision-making on goals, programs, and policies. The emerging theory really calls for two types of organization within the same institution — one for determining goals, policies, and programs (policy decisions) and the other for implementing policies and programs (executive decisions). Emerging theory accepts the line and staff solely for the purpose of implementing policies and programs developed by the total group concerned.

Democratic theory does not embrace any of the following assumptions:

1. That all decisions must be shared. Many decisions, implementing ones, are individual.
2. That the official leader never tells anyone they must do anything. He is responsible for enforcing policy.
3. That official leadership never takes a stand. He has as much responsibility for stating his position as anyone else.
4. That the amount of time available should not affect the decision-making procedure. Emergency decisions may limit discussion and degree of consensus.
5. That the official leader should not go ahead and make a decision if the group refuses to participate. Extend the opportunity and continue to do so but do not stop action because no one wants to participate.
6. That insisting that group members work out agreements for good of group is undemocratic. The leader has the responsibility for preserving the life of the group and must fight to do so.
7. That authority is not to be used. For service of the group, not for individual enhancement.

It has occurred to me that the line and staff was devised for the purpose of unifying effort in the name of achievement, whereas the effect, by denying participation, might well be a coerced effort which could well be adverse to achievement.

In essence, to me, man is demanding that those who would practice leadership in the decision-making process must first be those who have sufficient faith in man to dedicate their leadership to the release of man's potential. To the school administrator, this means that he who leads best is he who can most fully release and utilize the potential of those with whom he is associated.

Man is saying that his valued participation in policy decisions is the only source for his freely given support toward policy implementation. To the school administrator, this means that if he really expects to achieve efficiency in the realization of objectives he had better pay heed.

To me, man is saying more. He is saying that diversity should be valued for through diversity he is able to foresee more clearly the consequences of his decision, and this is a direct appeal to increase the intelligence which is brought to bear on the decision. To the school administrator, this means there are benefits to be derived simply by using that which democratic man professes to cherish.

To me, man is saying that he wants his experiences to be such that he will learn to function independently in his approach to problem-solving. To the school administrator, this means that the dependency-creating experiences found in the authoritarian climate are inappropriate.

And to me, man is asking that he be permitted to learn how to live together for he is anxious to enjoy his evolving identity. To the school administrator, this means that the only positive means yet invented for resolving conflicts is found in the democratic process.

In conclusion, I hope that it has been demonstrated in this discussion that man is once again on the move. Increased intelligence is powering this move, this time in the direction of self-direction. He marches with confidence for he has received the supreme compliment of being placed in charge of his fate. His philosophy and his research support him. This change requires that he have a voice in the decisions which affect him, and have it he will. The authoritarian decision-making method has tradition as its champion, but so had the horse and buggy and James Whitcomb Riley's "Outhouse."

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE DEAN'S LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR

by Raymond E. Schultz, Professor
Department of Higher Education
Florida State University

Introduction

One of the things hoped for by the Kellogg Foundation in the decision to support selected institutions for the JCLP was that this support — which was not for research per se — would stimulate research on junior college administration in these centers. The Foundation's hopes in this respect are being fulfilled. Within the next few years you can expect from the Centers an increasing amount of significant research which focuses on the administrative operation of the junior college. The report which you are about to hear is, I believe, indicative of the direction which this research will take.

Major work on the research which constitutes the focus of this report was done by J. O. Carson, formerly Director of the Meridian Mississippi Municipal Junior College and more recently a Kellogg Fellow at Florida State University. He was awarded the Ph. D. Degree by Florida State University this past June. My colleague, Maurice Litton, planned the statistical design for study and he deserves major credit for the project's success.

By virtue of the fact that the focus of this research was on the junior college dean, its significance for this Institute is obvious.

Nature of the Study

This investigation was designed to study the leadership behavior of the junior college dean. The perceptions and expectations of his behavior as viewed by student leaders, the president, department heads, and the dean himself were analyzed and compared. We were especially interested in learning whether the perceptions and expectations of the various groups create role conflicts for the dean.

The project was designed for the primary purpose of discovering whether or not students' perceptions and expectations of leadership behavior on the part of the dean introduce into the administrative situation the need for a leadership role different from that demanded by the professional staff. In order to do this it was necessary to make analysis also of the data collected from the other groups. Since I assumed that you would be interested in the findings as they relate to department heads, presidents, and deans, as well as student leaders, this report has been prepared accordingly.

In the analyses of these data a number of different statistical tests were employed. All differences reported as such were statistically significant. However, discussion of the statistical analyses employed did not seem relevant to the purpose of this presentation and henceforth reference to them will be very limited. An article providing a description of the statistical analyses has been submitted to the Journal of Experimental Education. No publication date has been specified but anyone interested in that phase of the project might watch for it in a subsequent issue of the Journal.

Background of the Study

Early research in the area of administrative leadership was based on the unitary trait theory of leadership. Principal postulates of this theory are: (1) that there exists a "leadership trait" which is innate or inherent; (2) that leaders alone possess this trait; (3) that, as with other traits, individuals vary in the degree to which they possess it; and (4) the trait, when possessed, functions with equal force in a variety of situations. The theory implied that the trait could be identified and measured. To date no such trait has been identified though a great deal of time and effort has gone into trying to do so.

Recent efforts at research in this area have focused increasingly on "leadership behavior" as differentiated from the unitary concept of "leadership". These efforts are meeting with considerable success. The point of reference with this approach is on behavior rather than presumed underlying capacity. This approach involves describing and measuring behavior of the leader and it emphasizes the how rather than the what of administration. This how aspect relates to the interpersonal relationships between a leader — in this case the dean — and those with whom he is involved in his administrative role — in this case the president, department heads, and student leaders. Assessing leadership behavior from this standpoint involves obtaining evidence on the

perceptions and expectations that associates have of the leader rather than focusing on his traits and an account of what he has done.

Description of the Instrument

The instrument employed for this study was the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire devised by the Personnel Research Board at Ohio State University. This instrument was well suited to the purposes of this investigation because it provides measures of two significant dimensions of leadership behavior, which have been given the names, "Initiating Structure" and "Consideration". These dimensions have been identified as being of primary importance in analyzing the executive function.

"Initiating Structure" can be described as emphasizing behavior involving the institution's operation through the assignment of individuals to tasks. Stated another way, this constitutes the formal aspects of administration. The dimension, "Consideration", delineates behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in relationships between the leader — in this case the dean — and those with whom he is involved in his administrative role.

Evidence is accumulating that effective administrative leadership requires a blending of these two dimensions of leadership in the administrator's behavior. The way in which they need to be blended seems to be governed both by the needs of the institution and of individuals in such a way as to make the institution at the same time organizationally productive and individually fulfilling.

Previous research involving the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire demonstrated its appropriateness for our investigation. It permitted assessing the dean's behavior both as perceived and expected by student leaders, department heads, the president and the dean himself on the two dimensions of leadership behavior — Initiating Structure and Consideration. Throughout this report "perceived" is used to mean what the dean's behavior was observed as being whereas "expected" is used to mean what was desired in the way of the dean's behavior.

The Sample and Procedure

The sample for this study was drawn from twenty public two-year colleges which met one or more of the following criteria. In order to be included an institution must be: (1) a member of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, (2) accredited by its state's Department of Public Instruction, and/or (3) approved by the public universities in the state which located. Institutions which qualified on this basis were further reduced to include only those (1) which enrolled between 200 and 700 students, and (2) only those within this enrollment range when both the president and dean had at least two years of tenure in their positions. A department head within a participating institution had to have been on the faculty for at least two years to be included and student leaders were limited to those who were enrolled in their second year at the junior college.

We did not select institutions with larger enrollments in an effort to assure that student leaders had a reasonable amount of contact with the dean. The same reasoning was applied in requiring at least two years in the institution by all respondents. We wanted to be as sure as was possible under the circumstances that there had been sufficient opportunity for acquaintance with the dean to facilitate valid responses.

Forty-two institutions in five states — Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Texas — were identified as meeting the institutional criteria. The presidents of thirty-four of these institutions expressed a willingness to have their institutions participate. Eight of these could not be included because the president or dean was newly appointed. Each president of the remaining twenty-six institutions was asked to name the administrator in his institution who, in the line-staff organization, held for the instructional, curricular, and extra-curricular programs of the institution. Not in every case did this person have the title of "dean" but he did meet the criteria of having direct administrative responsibility with both the president and department heads as well as having sufficient contact with student leaders to be reasonably well known by them.

Twenty deans of the twenty-six institutions which met all selection criteria accepted the invitation to participate. Geographically they were distributed as follows: Florida - 4, Georgia - 5, Mississippi -4, North Carolina - 1, and Texas - 5. It warrants mentioning at this point that all of these deans followed through on their responsibility to the extent that none of the twenty institutions was subsequently lost to the study.

Each participating dean submitted a list of the names and addresses of: (1) his department

or division heads — the term "department head" is used hereafter to designate the position — and (2) students who were members of the student council, student editors, and the sophomore class president. Where an institution listed more than seven departments, participation was limited to seven by random selection. This procedure provided 131 department heads of which 117 agreed to participate and 115 actually did. A maximum of ten students was chosen from each institution representing the leadership positions just mentioned. This provided a sample of 184 student leaders of whom 156 agreed to participate and 141 of those completed and returned the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire. In summary, cooperation from the participants was excellent.

Questions to Which Answers Were Sought

General reference has been made to the purpose of this investigation. These are now stated more specifically:

1. Do department heads and student leaders in one institution agree with their counterparts in other institutions on their perceived and expected behavior of the dean?
2. Do the perceptions and expectations of the dean held by one group differ from those held by another group? For instance, do department heads perceive and/or expect different behavior on the part of the dean than do presidents and/or student leaders?
3. Do the various groups, i. e., department heads, deans, presidents, and student leaders, perceive equal amounts of the dimensions Initiating Structure and Consideration in the dean's leadership behavior?
4. Do the various groups, i. e., department heads, dean's, presidents or student leaders, expect equal amounts of the dimensions Initiating Structure and Consideration in the dean's leadership behavior?
5. Do any of the groups expect more Initiating Structure or Consideration than they perceive.

Findings

The first question to which an answer was sought concerned only department heads and student leaders. That is because they represented a group within each institution whereas there was but one dean and one president representing each institution. Therefore, it was necessary to work with the mean scores of department heads and student leaders. A statistical test supported the appropriateness of this procedure for the data at hand.

With respect to Question 1, significant differences were found to exist in the perceptions and expectations held by student leaders and department heads in one institution compared to those held by student leaders and department heads in other institutions. This was true on both dimensions, Initiating Structure and Consideration. These differences support the theoretical concept underlying this investigation, namely, that the administrator's role is, in part, situationally derived. Using the terminology employed for this investigation, it means that the perceptions and expectations of the dean's leadership behavior held by the department heads, presidents, and student leaders vary from one junior college to another.

This suggests that a dean who is successful in one institution and transfers to another may find that he must alter his leadership behavior in the new assignment from what it was previously if he is to enjoy an equal measure of success in the new position. Failure to do this may explain, in part at least, why a very successful administrator in one institution sometimes has only limited success or even fails as an administrator in another institution. Conversely, the administrator who recognizes the situational factors related to leadership behavior and is able to adapt his behavior accordingly, can transfer successfully from one institution to another where circumstances differ greatly.

Question 2 was "Do the perceptions and expectations of the dean held by one group, e. g., department heads, differ significantly from those held by another group, e. g., presidents or student leaders?" To answer this question each group was compared with each other group by rank-difference correlations. This provided a measure of the extent of overall agreement between paired groups, i. e., presidents vs student leaders, presidents vs department heads, etc., based on the degree of agreement, institution by institution. Following are the results obtained from these comparisons:

1. There was no agreement between student leaders and presidents on either dimension to an extent that was statistically significant. Of the two dimensions, there was least agreement on Consideration.
2. Student leaders and department heads agreed to an extent that was statistically significant on Initiating Structure, both perceived and expected, and on expected Consideration.

Stated negatively, they disagreed on their perceptions of the dean's behavior on the dimension Consideration.

3. Student leaders and deans agreed to an extent that was statistically significant on their perception and expectations of the dean on all dimensions except perceived Initiating Structure.
4. Department heads and presidents failed to reach a degree of agreement that was statistically significant on a single comparison.
5. Department heads and deans agreed on the dean's expected behavior for both dimensions. However, they did not agree on their perceptions of his behavior on either dimension.
6. Presidents and deans agreed only on their perceptions of the dean's behavior on the dimension Initiating Structure.

These findings clearly indicate that role conflicts exist for the dean. The discrepancies between the president on the one hand and student leaders and department heads on the other, appear to produce his major role conflict. Resolving these conflicts would seem to require that the dean's behavior be dictated, in part at least, by the group with which he is involved at a given time. It is important that he have no "guilt complex" in doing this — which may be a concern that haunts the newly appointed dean.

The dean who successfully fulfills his role with the various groups with whom he associates in his administrative capacity presumably has learned to vary his leadership style or behavior in light of the situations which confront him at a given time. In doing so, he is neither a Jekyll and Hyde nor does he have the "Three Faces of Eve". Rather he varies the balance in his behavior on the two dimensions of Consideration and Initiating Structure as the situation demands with the view of making the institution at the same time organizationally productive and individually fulfilling.

Questions 3, 4, and 5 all relate to whether the various groups perceive and/or expect more of one dimension of leadership behavior than another or expect more of a given dimension than they perceive. Following is a summary of the findings as they relate to these questions.

1. Student leaders perceived about the same amount of both dimensions — in the dean's behavior. However, they expected significantly more on the dimension Consideration than they perceived. Further, they expected more of the dimension Consideration than of Initiating Structure but they also desired more of the latter dimension.
2. Department heads' responses followed a pattern similar to that of students. They expected significantly more of both dimensions than they perceived. Further, they expected and perceived more of the dimension Consideration than of the dimension Initiating Structure.
3. The only significant difference found for presidents on the basis of these comparisons was that they expected more of the dimension Initiating Structure on the part of the deans behavior than they perceived. Otherwise their perceptions and expectations were in line.
4. Deans themselves perceived significantly more of the dimension Consideration than of the dimension Initiating Structure in their behavior. Further, they felt that they should exhibit more of the dimension Initiating Structure than they perceived in their actions.

Several interesting points are brought out by these comparisons. On the one hand, we see each group wanting the dean to "run a tighter ship" — this included the dean himself. On the other hand, we find department heads and student leaders wanting the dean to exhibit more of the dimension Consideration than they perceive and more of that dimension than of Initiating Structure. Deans saw themselves as exhibiting more of the dimension Consideration than of Initiating Structure — the opposite of student leaders' perceptions. Finally, contrary to student leaders and department heads who wanted Consideration stressed more, deans apparantly felt. that their leadership behavior was adequate in this respect. These findings would seem to imply that while students and the faculty, as represented by department heads, want a well-administered institution from an organizational standpoint, they also want it to be one in which there is a sensitiveness to them as individuals, i. e., friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in relationships between them and the administration.

The discrepancy between the student leaders' and department heads' expectations of the dean compared with those by the presidents on the dimension Consideration may, in part, be explained by the different relationship that they have with the dean. The president is in a superior relationship to the dean while department heads and students are in a subordinate relationship to him. Obviously this produces different psychological settings. Whereas, the dean's authority constitutes no threat in his relations with the president, it undoubtedly is present in relations with his subordinates. Unless the dean is sensitive to this fact and governs his behavior with his subordinate groups accordingly, they are likely to consider him insensitive and dogmatic. When

this happens the result may be poor morale which undermines the institution's effectiveness.

Conversely, these findings suggest that unless the dean makes assignments as needed to get the tasks of the institution accomplished and holds persons responsible for them; unless he develops a pattern of organization that is effective; unless he keeps channels of communication open, the institution will flounder. When this happens the faculty and student body can be expected to resent the dean's lack of leadership. In short, the results of this study support the view that for an institution to be productive and effective it needs a dean who is capable of establishing a pattern of organization, if you like, of being "hard nosed" about the operation of an institution when necessary, while at the same time demonstrating through his relations with the faculty and student body that he is concerned with them as individual human beings.

Summary

In summary, following are the findings of this investigation that appear to be of major importance:

1. We can expect the perceptions and expectations of the dean's leadership behavior by others to vary from one institution to another.
2. Department heads and student leaders have role perceptions and expectations on the part of the dean different from those of the president.
3. Department heads and student leaders expect the dean to stress the dimension Consideration more than he does the dimension Initiating Structure.
4. Department heads, student leaders, and presidents all would have the dean emphasize the Initiating Structure dimension more in his behavior.
5. Department heads and student leaders desire more of the dimension Consideration in the dean's leadership behavior than they perceive.

In conclusion, department heads and student leaders appear to be referent groups sufficiently different from the president and each other to warrant modifications in the dean's leadership style as he deals with them. Finally, it appears that most deans would do well to emphasize more the dimension Consideration in their relations both with the staff and students.

DEVELOPING AND RELEASING FACULTY POTENTIAL

Maurice L. Litton
Associate Professor
Department of Higher Education
Florida State University

Last June when I accepted the responsibility for addressing you at this time I was extremely well-pleased with this title. It's catchy; looks nice in print; and sounds as if it could be interesting.

But when I started to work on the speech I suddenly discovered I didn't care much for it. Here are some of the random thoughts that occurred to me: (1) Can you develop potential — or does potential mean something that was already there? (2) The title implies the faculty has a potential that hasn't been released — but do we know if the potential is for good or evil? (3) Are we sure we want to release all this potential — somebody might have the potential to be a better dean than we are.

Perhaps a better title for what I am going to say is, "How to get better mileage out of your faculty," or, if this sounds too prosaic, "How to get better performance out of your faculty."

These questions give the right connotation. You are now getting good performance out of your faculty — but — it could be improved. What is needed is a tune-up job; not a major overhaul or a motor replacement, and certainly not a new vehicle at this time. A good tune-up job should eliminate some of the knocks and squeaks and should bring about a much better performance.

When you take your car to the mechanic for a tune-up job he listens to the motor and makes his diagnosis, based on what he hears, in the light of his previous experience with similar motors.

That's what I want to do this morning. The listening will be done in terms of answers to a questionnaire filled out by all the full time faculty personnel in white public junior colleges in Florida. The diagnosis and the prescriptions I give will be based on twelve years of wearing the title Dean, during which time I can assure you that I made all the mistakes that were popular at the time. Undoubtedly, in this day of automation when everything is done faster and better, some of you may make bigger mistakes, but let us hope not.

Just a word about the questionnaire. The Division of Community Junior Colleges of the State Department of Education of Florida is now engaged in an evaluation study of junior colleges in Florida. This study is being made for the newly appointed State Advisory Board. The study is divided into five areas and a task force is working in each area. A 270-item questionnaire was prepared for the task force on faculty by Douglas Montgomery, a Kellogg Fellow at Florida State University. Useable replies were received from almost 100 per cent of the full time faculty members.

As I studied the replies to the questions in this instrument, and as I recalled my own mistakes, it seemed to me that most of the things that hamper faculty in the performance of their duty would be erased if we would grant FOUR FREEDOMS TO THE FACULTY.

Granted! It is presumptuous to ask for four freedoms for teachers. After all, that's the number FDR wanted for everybody. Because they are dedicated to their work, teachers are expected to be satisfied with three if everybody else has four. (There is no one here to tell on us; let's be real devilish and ask for FOUR FREEDOMS FOR FACULTY FOLK.)

The first freedom I propose is FREEDOM FROM WANT. To the question, "What are your two main dissatisfactions with junior college work?", 28 per cent of the faculty members indicated pay as their first choice and an additional 10 per cent selected pay as the second choice. (It is interesting to note that 26 per cent on the first choice and 41 per cent on the second choice checked none on this question.)

Here is more evidence that Florida public junior college teachers are not paid a liveable wage. Forty-eight per cent reported that they were carrying an overload for which they were receiving additional compensation; sixteen per cent reported they were working outside of the college; and forty per cent reported that a second member of the family was working. If we total these three, we have 104 per cent of the full time teachers in the white public junior colleges of Florida now supplementing their income by additional work at the college or elsewhere, or by another member of the family working. Of course there are duplicates, but is there any question

that a majority are not living on their basic junior college salary? (Let me point out now that the standard of living in Florida is not quite the standard set by North Carolina state Republican chairmen.)

But you say this is an old, old story. There never is and probably never will be enough to pay the instructional salaries we want to pay.

Let me suggest three approaches. First, re-examine your fiscal policies to see if you are getting all you can for your dollar. Business and Industry have for years accused us of gross inefficiency. Is it true? Probably not, but there must be some truth in it or we wouldn't continue to hear it.

You probably read the story a few weeks ago about the bandit holding up the payroll clerk. "To heck with the payroll," he says, "just give me the withholdings and the fringe benefits." I doubt we can do much about the withholding tax, but I am interested in the fringe benefits. I wonder if any junior college — especially a public junior college — has really investigated this area. Have we made any real efforts to stretch the income of the teacher or do we complacently reply that we are prohibited by law from spending money in certain ways? Laws can be changed, you know, and if not by the State legislature, there is always the Supreme Court.

My point is simply this. If fringe benefits are more valuable than salary increases, let's investigate.

The second approach to this most difficult problem is to keep the supporting public informed through a good public relations program. This is a continuous job that merits the support of all and demands the attention of the head man. The competition for the tax or gift dollar is keen and the response to our requests will vary directly with the caliber of the public relations program.

The third approach to the improvement of the financial climate is a little more difficult to express. Bluntly stated, it is, "Quit letting the public buy too cheaply."

I wonder how many new programs have been started like this. The Dean and faculty work out a program that is needed at the college. There is no question about the need. Everyone agrees. Estimates of requirements including facilities, equipment, and personnel are carefully prepared. The plan is presented to the governing board.

"Yes, we do need the program. Additional rooms? Out of the question at this time. You can get the space you need by taking over that large faculty office. Oh! They can always find an empty classroom somewhere to grade papers in. Now we will have to buy the equipment and we will have to hire one new faculty member but the rest of this stuff can be spread out among the rest of the faculty."

Horrible? Yes. But in the desire to get a new program started, we make deals just like this.

Have any of you approached your faculty like this? We are going to have to ask you to teach an overload this semester (this year). It may go on for two years, but by then we will be able to justify another faculty member in your department.

I am all for progress; I am all for expansion; and I am all for growth and development, but I question the wisdom of doing this by exploiting the faculty. Let's add a new program only when the supporting public is willing to pay the full price for it. And I don't think we will lose a thing by this attitude. I think we will gain the respect of the public and I am sure the faculty morale will improve.

"Too much month at the end of the money" has been the typical faculty member's lot for too long. I have suggested three approaches that might help alleviate this situation:

(1) Devote some time and energy to finding ways of stretching the income dollar.
(2) Develop and maintain a good Public Relations program for more dollars to stretch.
(3) Quit exploiting the faculty in the name of "This is needed for the students" when what we really mean is "This makes me, the dean, look good." "The best things in life are free" are good words for a song, but hardly appropriate as a guiding principle in developing a junior college.

Faculty people have other wants. They want and are entitled to adequate facilities and equipment. Facilities include office space and equipment includes any equipment that will make the teacher a more effective person. Let me make two suggestions.

(1) Make typewriters available to your people. A typewriter in every office would be my goal. Many instructors prefer to type out their own tests and notes — this is frequently easier for them than getting the material in shape for a typist. At least give them a typewriter if they ask for one.

(2) The other area I want to mention is visual aid equipment. I hope you will all agree that this equipment is effective in the learning process. We purchase one 16 mm projector, one opaque projector, a filmstrip machine, blackout curtains for one room and announce to the faculty that we now have visual aid equipment and we want them to make use of these valuable teaching aids. Of course, they must plan ahead by ordering film or other material and they must sign up to use the various machines and the room with the blackout curtains.

Then we are disappointed because faculty members do not make use of this equipment and we fret about the $1,000 to $1,500 that we wasted. And it is wasted with this kind of program; not because we bought too much, but because we bought too little. Hopefully, each classroom should be equipped with the visual aids we have mentioned and all should be capable of being darkened. (This is not expensive in a new building for blackout venetian blinds are available for the same price as regular venetian blinds.

The truth of the matter is that faculty members will use visual aids — and use them effectively — if they are readily available to them. They will not use them if they have to anticipate their needs two or three weeks in advance and go to the trouble of booking machines, getting them moved and perhaps moving the class to a different room. This is just too much trouble.

I know equipment in each classroom is probably out of the question but a realistic goal might be a set of equipment for each department or, if more convenient, for each floor in a building.

The second freedom I propose is FREEDOM FROM WORK — work, that is, that can be done by non-certificated people. Evidence for this need is as follows:

Sixty per cent of faculty personnel in the Florida study reported working 48 or more hours per week. This presumably does not include the hours spent on overload either for the college or for an outside agency. Why not a 40 hour week for teachers? I think we deserve it, and we are not going to get the best performance from these people if we expect them to work 48 hours in a country where 40 or less is standard.

We are making some progress in a couple of areas. Most of you have some clerical assistance for your faculty and some of you are using people without degrees in your stock rooms and perhaps in your audio-visual department. Wonderful! Let's attack on another front.

More than half of the teachers in our survey reported they were spending 10 or more per cent of their time on student activities.

If we could eliminate this area of work as a part of their job, teachers would almost have a 40-hour-week job. Before you jump down my throat, let me ask if a master's degree is an absolutely necessary qualification for chaperoning a dance? Of course, many of the activities are closely related to the instructional program and probably should not be separated. If this is true, use the instructional staff and reduce their teaching loads. But many of the activities could be done by other people — perhaps better — and at less cost, if we paid teachers for this extra work as we should.

The need for relief from some responsibility can be pointed out in another way. When asked, "What are your two main dissatisfactions with working conditions in a junior college?", 25 per cent of the respondents checked "lack of time for class preparation" either as a first or as a second dissatisfaction. Twenty-three per cent checked "lack of time for research." To me, good teaching and research are closely interwoven and cannot be separated. I think the faculty is saying, "free us from the burden of some of this work that can be done by others and we will do a better job in the field where we are most competent — teaching."

My third freedom is FREEDOM FROM STUDENTS — for at least a part of the time.

We hire a person to do a teaching job. We may or may not provide him with an office, but if we do we encourage him to maintain our open door policy. Always be available to help the student with his problems. Never be too busy to listen to his troubles. Explain to him again how

to work the problem that you worked three times in class and the only reason he didn't understand it was because he didn't get up in time to come to class.

I insist that your good faculty members post not-to-be-disturbed hours as well as office hours. Give them an opportunity to make class preparations and to study. Seventy-five per cent of our group of teachers reported less than 10 per cent of their time was spent in professional study.

Don't we best meet student needs by providing the best possible instructional program?

Let me hasten on with the fourth freedom: FREEDOM FROM WORRY. I have used the word worry for convenience. What I mean is freedom from the gnawing suspicion that what they are doing is not really very important work after all.

You say you don't have this problem at your college because each year at the fall faculty conference the president or the dean makes a speech and tells the faculty how important the instructional program is and how much he is counting on them to do an outstanding job.

O.K. I am a new faculty member. Young, naive, and willing. I leave the meeting inspired and determined to do my teaching best.

I am not really concerned about sponsoring two clubs, serving on three faculty committees, and taking my turn chaperoning dances. After all, Dr. Litton in the Community Junior College course warned me to expect to spend at least 20 per cent of my time in these areas. He said 10 per cent on student activities and 10 per cent on committee and administrative duties were about par - in Florida, anyway.

I am glad I accepted this position, for this college really puts emphasis where I think it belongs — on teaching. The president said he believed the instructional program was the heart of the institution and that all other activities were supported only because they made a contribution to the instructional program. He said the classroom teacher was the most important person on the campus — with the exception of the student, of course. He said the administration was the apex of the inverted triangle and here to help the faculty and students find solution to their problems.

One month later. Gee, I wish my schedule were different. Teaching five classes on M-W-F is killing me. I know. I asked for it. I thought it would be so wonderful to have Tuesdays and Thursdays completely free. It is the three classes in a row that really get me down. I just don't believe that anyone can do a first-rate job of instruction for more than two consecutive hours. It seems to me that an administration that places such high value on instruction would have some ground rules to prevent us from making foolish choices.

Still, Professor Potwarmer says he has been teaching all his classes on M-W-F for years. Someone says he has another job on Tuesdays and Thursdays. I guess he is just a better man than I am. I know I would do a better job if the Dean would insist that my teaching load be spread as evenly as possible over the five days — and with no three classes in succession, please.

Two months later. I was talking to the basketball coach today. Did you know he draws $1200 above the salary schedule? Eight hundred dollars because he is head basketball coach and $400 for assisting with baseball. I told him I thought the college had a single salary schedule based on years of experience and qualifications. He said that was right, but coaches are paid extra because they have to work so late in the afternoons and then they are tied up a couple of nights a week with games during the season. I guess that's all right. Come to think of it, I do hear them in the showers along about six o'clock when I leave the building. I hope I can see some of the basketball games this season, but I meet with Circle K boys on Monday night (we just couldn't find a suitable time during the day); Tuesday night is my National Guard night; Wednesday night is church night and I like to spend some time with my family.

Three months later. I was talking to Mr. Smart today. You know he had my job last year but he took six hours of counseling in summer school and was transferred to the counseling staff. He says he still prefers teaching (and from what I hear he was a good one) but the extra month's pay is just too great a temptation. Counselors start to work two weeks before the instructional staff and sometimes they have to stay on a little while after school closes in the spring. Depends on how well they keep up with their work.

One of the fellows in our department has a good idea for team teaching and use of programmed instruction. He says he needs about two weeks to get it ready for a test run. There certainly isn't any time to work on it during the school year. I suggested that I could help him in August but he works three months each summer for Tastemark Dairy. Says, with his family, he can't

afford to give up two weeks' pay.

Four months later. The semester will soon be over. I wonder if I have done a good job. Chairman Choosy seems pleased. He sat through a class in September and he stayed a few minutes the other day when he came in to tell me about the faculty meeting that had been called for that afternoon. Dean Dynamo came in for a few minutes one day. He didn't make any comments and he never did call me in for a conference. I thought he would have visited my class several times during this first semester. There are a couple of minor problems that concern me, but he always seems to be so busy.

I am not surprised and not really disappointed — but I thought President Promoter might visit one of my classes this semester. I saw him at the Christmas play just before the holidays and he explained to me how much he liked to make an appearance at student presentations to let the students know he was interested in them and in their activities.

Five months later. The second semester is off to a pretty good start. I suppose my work is satisfactory. They say as long as I don't get any complaints from the administration, everything is fine. If they are not satisfied, they will let you know.

There is one thing they do that I don't like. All last semester (and it has started again this semester) my classes were interrupted for announcements and promotion schemes for various student activities. Yesterday my class was dismissed so the students could attend the assembly program. I know these activities are important but damn it, what I am doing in the classroom is important, too.

I think this is enough to make the point. I am a disillusioned and disappointed faculty member — slow learner, too, because most of your new faculty members are going to find out within five weeks that the importance you put on instruction when you talk about it is not necessarily reflected by your actions.

I have suggested four freedoms for faculty folk. Freedom from want would insure the faculty member a salary commensurate with the importance of his job and adequate facilities with which to work. This suggests either getting more dollars or getting more out of our dollars, or both. We must study all possibilities.

Freedom from work that can be performed by non-certificated people is another area for much improvement if we are to get better performance from our faculties. We are making some progress in this area.

We are not providing teachers with enough time for preparation and professional study according to our survey of Florida Junior College Instructors. This is a tragic mistake that must be corrected.

And last, but not least, our policies, financial and personnel, should place the same high emphasis on instruction that we place on it in our speeches to faculties.

DEVELOPING STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES

Thomas B. Merson
Assistant Director For Commissions
American Association Of Junior Colleges

DEVELOPING STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES

We all recognize that the final goal of our effort as educators is to help students become more capable and more self-reliant. As we organize opportunities for students to develop we clearly realize that their development is a shared responsibility between student and staff. To subscribe to the idea that students should from the beginning be entirely self-reliant is folly; if this were best there would be no need for a college or for students to enroll in it. Yet a college which does not hold development of self-reliance as a major goal to be sought will fail to use its resources most productively. The questions are:

1. How much of the job is the responsibility of the college?
2. How much of the job is the responsibility of the student?
3. In what ways can we make more of the job the responsibility of students?

The rationale for productive answers to these questions are woven throughout the literature in educational psychology. Two categories of facts have bearing on the action we may choose for our college:

1. Individuals differ.

   - Some students can reach higher levels of responsibility than others; to expect all to attain the same degree of self-dependence is unrealistic.

   - Some move to a given level faster than others; on a scale of independence some are higher at the time they enroll with you than others will be when they leave — or for that matter ever be.

   - Maturation or readiness is prerequisite to achievement of anything including self-reliance. We've all known adolescents whose responsibility rating moved almost overnight from one end of the scale to the other; internal as well as external influences must be considered.

   - Self-reliance is a complex goal, made up on many complex and interrelated factors. It is achieved, however, only through education; it is reached by a combination of self-effort and opportunity.

   - Education, including development of self-reliance, can be derived both from class instruction and from extra-class experiences, both organized and unorganized.

2. Student responsibility will develop better in an institutional climate which places a premium on this goal. Such an institution -

   - Expects excellence and frowns on shoddiness.

   - Stresses the importance of dedicating one's self to worthy goals.

   - Honors and overtly respects worthy goals, reduces the attraction of unworthy goals; yet respects individual freedom of choice.

An institution which decides to increase its effort to stimulate student self-reliance should give organized attention to four considerations:

1. Define and clarify the kinds of self-reliance and the kind of student responsibilities you want to foster.
2. Identify the many sources of knowledge students must have which give them a basis for confidence in themselves and in their ability to be independent; provide this knowledge through as many sources as are practical.
3. Organize opportunities for students to practice assuming increased responsibility; these can be both curricular and extra curricular.
4. Reward desired behavior through favorable recognition, opportunity for increased freedom of choice, and increased responsibility.

Your college will want to identify early different levels of student dependency and independence. Many students are unable at first to cope with the increased opportunity for independence which college offers. Others do not readily recognize the opportunity for or the desirability of developing independence of action. Alert instructors, counselors and advisers are in a position to skillfully assist those who do not appear to have chosen well for themselves.

An institution must identify the kinds of student responsibilities it wishes to foster. The original title for this paper was "determining student responsibilities." Social acceptance largely determines which responsibilities should be selected for special attention. Statements of goals of general education enumerate the aims subscribed to by most colleges. In a recent publication, McDaniel describes the strategies of junior college which are aimed toward developing "men and women capable of freedom."[1] He outlines the strategies as follows:

Admits Students differing in:

- Abilities
- Achievements
- Choices
- Resources

Provides Instruction in:

- Transfer Curricula
- Occupational Curricula
- General Education
- Reinforcement Programs
- Continuing Education

To (enable students to) achieve:

- Professional status
- Employment
- Personal Enrichment
- Renewed Opportunity
- Upgrading

Leading Students toward sound development of:

- Character
- Intellect
- Personality
- Citizenship
- Vocational Comptence[2]

Assuming we agree that the five goals listed above are major goals of the educational effort of the college and assuming that we agree that we want students to develop significant responsibility in each of these, how do we as college deans proceed to achieve these ends? Some illustrative comments follow:

Character

What kind of character development do we seek? Is it trustworthiness? dependability? honesty? respect of individuals? As a faculty we must identify specific character traits we wish to develop before we plan procedures and organize opportunities. Some suggested means of stimulating students to assume responsibility for character development include:

1. Impose responsibility on students. Provide minimal restrictions; give them opportunity to make mistakes.
2. Provide instruction about common stumbling points and recognize their failures as opportunities to teach.
3. Tangibly recognize desired action.
4. As an institutional project seek a basic ill of our society which the students are willing

---

[1] J. W. McDaniel, Essential Student Personnel Practices for Junior Colleges, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1962, p. 11.

[2] Ibid., p. 12

to tackle and use that as a focal point for united effort. Service to others often stimulates many to rise to levels otherwise not considered by them to be worthy of extra effort.

A committee of the Student Personnel Commission, American Association of Junior Colleges under the chairmanship of Dr. Sam Neel, President, Manatee Junior College, is urging junior colleges to volunteer to initiate a cooperative faculty-student effort to increase student moral responsibility. Dr. Neel would welcome the chance to work with your college in an effort of this kind. Merrimon Cuninggim, Executive Director, Danforth Foundation, in an inspiring address to the AAJC Convention in Denver has provided us with concrete suggestions which colleges everywhere might well consider.[3]

Intellect

Before we can design means of stimulating student responsibility for his intellectual development we must also first ask what kind of intellectual development we want? And what degree of freedom of thought can we condone in our respective institutions? Would you agree that we want students to be independently perceptive? sensitive? analytical? imaginative? creative? as well as informed? If you answer affirmatively, are you prepared for students who become so moved by the intellectual challenge of a dynamic college that they feel with missionary zeal their responsibility to be perceptive, and are lead naturally to perceive issues which the college would prefer to let be dormant? Or students who become sensitive to social injustices and who feel strongly a responsibility to crusade? We could extend the discussion to the other intellectual traits listed above. I am trying to make the point that the college must consider the natural consequences of subscribing to action which will stimulate student independence of thought - and here is precicely where the other consideration of responsibility must be brought into focus.

Some means by which a college can encourage students toward a greater degree of responsibility for their own intellectual development include:

1. Encourage instructors of every class to consider it a basic aim of each course to develop intellectual independence and to structure assignments, examinations and content to these ends. It doesn't require much searching to find many opportunities in most of our courses to increase our success with such a goal.
2. Organize out-of-class activities designed to achieve these ends. Ideally they involve both faculty and students — and even others from your community. Intellectually challenging seminars and forums in an informal setting have proved very effective and rewarding.
3. Establish honors programs and programs of independent study. These have almost universally contributed to both independence and responsibility.

Personality

We are all aware that personalities can be changed. Many students are sensitive that their personalities are not all they would like them to be, but too few colleges plan programs designed to bring about desired development. This seems a fertile field for increased attention.

What personality traits does the college regard desirable? Does it want everyone to be an extrovert, or does it recognize that many introverts are not unhappy? Can we have happy, buoyant, expressive, effusive, uninhibited and carefree individuals who are not irresponsible? If we want to develop among other traits one of consideration for the welfare of others, can this be accomplished best in classes or in extra-class settings?

In colleges which have concerned themselves with personality development several means have proved effective:

1. Identifying students whose personalities might profitably be improved. Alert instructors and counselors can readily identify these students without the students being aware of this effort.
2. Pairing these students unostentatiously with others from whom they may learn by association some effective approaches to a variety of personal and social situations.
3. Involving students in activities which provide and require increasing responsibility for those personality traits you are seeking to build. Student club activities provide an admirable opportunity for such progressive development.

---

[3] Merrimon Cunninggim, "Education for Moral Responsibility" Junior College Journal May, 1962, pp. 492 - 503.

Citizenship

We so many times reiterate that the privileges of citizenship entail corresponding responsibilities. Our colleges usually have well planned programs to insure acquisition of knowledge relating to citizenship. But far too few colleges plan programs that require each student to demonstrate that he has developed a high level of responsibility for his citizenship roles. The percentage voting either in a public election or a college election attest to the extent to which responsibility is lacking even in the most simple form. Our programs must do more than provide a fund of information essental to enlightened citizenship;

They must also develop attitudes which lead to student commitment to: (1) become sensitive to the importance of group welfare rather than individual gain, and (2) recognize that group welfare depends on individual responsibility.

Means of developing attitudes and skills which may lead students toward active citizenship roles include the following:

1. Recognizing that the college offers every opportunity for citizenship participation that students will encounter in post-college life. The college must encourage students to identify these opportunities, to give them greater visibility, and to make participation in them attractive.
2. In promoting opportunities for developing responsibility for effective citizenship the college should place before each student citizenship decisions which are important to him. Too often it seems to him of little importance whether this person or that holds a contested office; the student too rarely gets opportunity to express his feelings on issues which appear to have immediate consequences to him.
3. The transition from college citizenship to responsible citizenship in the larger community can be directed to some extent by encouraging participation in community civic life as students. Many courses closely parallel the work of active political and civic organizations and many governmental posts are dealing daily with topics which in the classroom setting seem to be only of academic interest. When students participate in civic and political affairs as part of the requirement of these courses, carry-over is enhanced.
4. Student government should be the laboratory of citizenship exploration.

Vocational Competence

One needs only to have his automobile repaired poorly, or to be met by an indifferent clerk in a store to realize how fundamental to vocational competence are attitudes which stress the responsibility of all to do our jobs well. Pride in excellent craftsmanship is not limited to those who work in the crafts; it is fundamental to success in any vocation and students must be impressed by this somewhere in their programs. A further basic attitude to be sought is appreciation for the worth and dignity of all honest labor. There is far too much stratified snobbery, particularly by those who have had the advantage of a college education. One further basic attitude to be sought is that of each student feeling a personal obligation to render service commensurate with his renumeration — an obligation to "earn his salt."

To provide situations which promote individual sensitivity for these attitudes in liberal arts programs is at best artificial. These opportunities, however, can and should be an integral part of all vocational programs. Work experience programs readily provide experiences which make the importance of these responsibilities clear. In any event, students might well be encouraged to make periodic, systematic evaluations of the extent to which these traits are developed. Essentially they are traits which are not distinctly seperate from those discussed under character, intellect, and personality and citizenship.

Any college will use many means to develop increased student responsibility. Some colleges will centralize this effort, others will decentralize it; some will approach it quite formally, the effort of others will appear very informal. And the results differ from college to college just as they do from student to student. Altogether, however, there are three categories of institutional activity which have particular relevance for consideration by a college which is seriously considering increasing student responsibility; the student activity program, the instructional program and the counseling-guidance program.

Student Activity Program. A college must early recognize that a student activity program is not an end in itself; rather it is an effective means of achieving many of the larger goals of the college. The enthusiasm of active students sometimes causes a college to lose perspective; in such cases more important efforts may be relegated to positions of secondary importance and priority. Such practice usually does not lead the college to a position in which it can make its

greatest contribution to the students, nor to the community. On the other hand, when the student activity program is conceived as the laboratory in which the enriching experiences available through it give meaning and purpose to the theory and principles enunciated in the classroom, it provides significant opportunity for developing student responsibility.

The varied programs of colleges with vigorous student activity programs embrace student government, assemblies, clubs, publications, athletics and a variety of non-athletic community-related performance groups such as band, choral and theater.

Among the means used successfully by colleges to make student activity programs effective in developing responsibility are the following:

1. A pre-school retreat for student leaders in which these leaders are encouraged to assume responsibility themselves, and to share responsibility with others.
2. Classes for credit in activity-related fields such as student government, publications, athletics, music and theater, serve as a means to involve more students and to distribute responsible opportunities.
3. Planned participation for large numbers such as emphasis on intra-mural rather than intercollegiate sports, broadens opportunity.
4. Planned participation for those who need this opportunity rather than for those whose previous experience has been one of heavy involvement in activity leadership.
5. Emphasis on values to be derived by the students from participation, rather than emphasis on the quality of a public performance.

Instructional Programs

Outstanding instructors have many ways of stimulating their students to accelerated speed. in reaching independence. All recognize that making assignments clear and providing students with a syllabus are not spoon-feeding approaches which lead to less student responsibility. Rather these are accepted devices which when properly done provide a framework and reference points which stimulate students to reach out with confidence. Above all, however, able instructors clearly let students know that they are individually responsible for the best they can produce; a request to redo shoddy work frequently makes the point indelibly clear.

Counseling Program

Counselors and all who have an active part in the student personnel program can play a significant role in assisting a college to formulate and implement practices which lead to increased student responsibility. Among their most valuable contributions is that of identifying students whose personalities will respond to various approaches and recommending those approaches which have proved most successful. In addition to this institutional responsibility the counseling staff have responsibilities to each student (1) to ascertain that he has the information he needs for wise decisions, (2) to encourage him to weigh alternatives and (3) to determine that he is aware of the full range of opportunities available to him.

Summary

This paper has supported the position that college students should develop an increased level of responsibility as a result of programs planned to achieve this end. It was emphasized that because students differ, the efforts of the college must be individualized. It was asserted that colleges which expect students to develop independence will be more successful than those which do not consider this an important goal. The paper further suggested means by which a college could assist students in achieving independence and in developing a desire to assume responsibility. This institutional effort will be most successful when administration, instructors, and counselors all cooperate to plan effective classroom and extra-curricular activities which seek to give students every opportunity to participate actively in experiences so organized as to require that students demonstrate increasing self-direction and independence.